MODERATOR: Stevens Point Public Comment Meeting for Annex 2001, October 4, 2004.

(tape shuts off)

MALE: (not understandable)

CHUCK LEDIN: I don't think so. I don't think there is, the agreements right now don't have any reference to that part of the law. And (not understandable).

MALE: (not understandable) definition of (not understandable) and diversion. Diversion means the water is going to be used (not understandable) processing (not understandable).

CHUCK LEDIN: Okay the withdrawal is any use of service or ground water. The diversion is anytime it goes across the drainage basin line regardless of whether it's (not understandable) or not. And consumptive use would be like the evaporation at a power plant where they are using cooling water and the water is lost to evaporation. So the requirements for diversion right now are that the water has to be returned and either in or adjacent to the place it was taken from and at standards that meet all applicable federal, state, and local laws.

MALE: (not understandable).

(background voices like singing in a nearby room or hallway)

CHUCK LEDIN: No they don't. Right now the Canadians have federal and provincial laws that prohibit any diversions. Flat outright. So I don't, they will have to do some things to change their laws to fit with some of these things but the Canadian system of Water Quality Standards and Regulations is much different than ours.

MALE: (not understandable) three categories and (not understandable) legislation (not understandable)?

CHUCK LEDIN: Ah no. Because we know pretty much about surface water withdrawals right now. We don't know very much about ground water withdrawals. So one of the first things on this side, one of the things they mentioned was that (not understandable) management has to be kind of standardized around the region. And one part of the agreement is that...

(door opens and closes)

MALE1: ...every five years we'll get together and review the data that all attending jurisdictions had...

(clacking noises)

CHUCK LEDIN: …(not understandable) selected. But right now there's no way to really predict that because we don't even know for sure what we're taking out of the ground water right now.

MALE2: (not understandable) I'm wondering how these usage numbers were established. Are there existing uses that have approached or exceed these hundred thousand gallons per day limits currently? Or is that just a number that somebody invented?

CHUCK LEDIN: It's a number that somebody invented and they invented it back in 1985 and in 1985 they said we ought to have a system in place in all 10 governments that if somebody uses more than 100,000 gallons a day that they're managed in some way. Whether it's registered, whether it's permit, whether it's plan approval, whatever it might be. We ought to have a system that's the same for all 10 governments. And that was just a threshold that was picked. To try to stay away from an individual home wells or small type wells and get up into commercial or municipal kinds of applications.

MALE2: And does anybody approach that number now?

CHUCK LEDIN: A hundred-thousand…?

MALE2: …commercial or governmental use?

CHUCK LEDIN: Oh sure. The City of Milwaukee pumps about 160 million gallons a day…

MALE2: …how many gallons a day?

CHUCK LEDIN: The City of Chicago pumps about 2 billion gallons a day. There's probably um (thinking) I would say maybe about 30 industries that are over 5 million gallons a day and all the power plants are well over a million gallons a day.

MALE: (not understandable).

CHUCK LEDIN: Well 5 million gallons was from the original 1985 charter. And at that time again we had no scientific basis, it was just the 10 governments said, "If we're going to get together to look at these projects, we should only do it when it's pretty significant to all of us." And they threw that number out as saying below that threshold it's probably is not going to be that significant to the system as a whole. Now, because there has been a great deal of concern about that number being too big from this proposal it introduces the 1 million gallons (not understandable).

MALE: (not understandable).

CHUCK LEDIN: I think they were anticipating and I can't say for sure but I think they were anticipating about 3 million gallons a month.

MALE: (not understandable).

MALE1: Well…

MALE: …(not understandable) even though I'm…

MALE1: ...I can't remember the exact...

MALE: ...giving, I'm...(not understandable) that's right. (not understandable).

MALE: And but did this happen?

CHUCK LEDIN 1: No.

MALE: It didn't happen?

CHUCK LEDIN: No. Under our federal law it's a prohibition to do that unless the water is used as (not understandable) water. And all the ships right now on the U.S. side are checked at (not understandable) and New York because they got (not understandable) Coast Guard checks what they're doing so there is a stop and a check in the system.

MALE: (not understandable)...is that much water from one Great Lake (not understandable)?

CHUCK LEDIN: Well the Canadians have several diversions coming in to those Great Lakes. And even in Wisconsin we have a little diversion coming into the Great Lakes at Portage where the old ship canal (not understandable) the Wisconsin River and the Fox River come together. But there is more water coming in to the lakes than historically because of the Canadian diversions that have been done. From the Hudson Bay drainage to the Great Lakes.

MALE: So that's (not understandable) concerned about the diversion from Hudson Bay into (not understandable)?

CHUCK LEDIN: Well I wouldn't say nobody's...there's probably some people that live up in Hudson Bay drainage there that are real concerned about it. And those things happened, you know, before this process was in place. So I think any attempt to do something similar to that right now would have a lot of discussions associated with it. And I think one of the, as an example, there were three projects that occurred. One in Wisconsin at Pleasant Prairie in Kenosha where we requested that 3.2 million be allowed to be used for the Village of Pleasant Prairie who had radium in their groundwater supply. Lowell(?), Indiana had the same thing. And the Village, or the City of Akron and the Village of Green in Ohio had contaminated water supply problems. Pleasant Prairie was approved finally only under the condition that all the water ultimately returned to Lake Michigan. Lowell, Indiana was denied outright even though that was only about 2 million gallons a day and the Ohio was only approved after a return flow was required there as well. And one of the concerns we had in the Ohio one the State of Wisconin had was we didn't want to look at water diversions, water exchanges it just is arithmetic. Water in, water out. Once you start moving water around you're also starting to move everything that's in that water. And the thing is everyone has probably heard about the very big controversy on the Chicago (not understandable) trying to get the barrier to protect from Asian carp coming in to the Great Lakes. We need to think that in any kind of water diversion proposal needs to look at those kinds of issues to make sure that you're not satisfying one need for water but at the same time, causing this large catastrophe by moving exotic species. So there's a lot of things that come into play on moving water around that these kinds of questions will prompt a better review of it in the future and in the past it was done more on just looking at keeping a net of zero for water in and water out. Now there will be a broader review both on alternatives and equalizing impacts.

MALE: (not understandable) question I can ask you.

CHUCK LEDIN: Sure.

MALE: Apparently some of the regulations for (not understandable) one state (not understandable) this appears to remedy that (not understandable) without the assurance of the other states. But is there any guidelines in this or any attempt to regulate all (not understandable) one state that may be kind of free wheeling to give these permits (not understandable) Is there any control on that?

CHUCK LEDIN: Well there are some...let's call it the 1 million gallon exemption rate. There's also a 250,000 exemption for communities that straddle the border or are within 12 miles of a hydrologic border where they wouldn't have to return the flow. One of the concerns that has come up in some of the public comment process so far is the cumulative impact of many of these things. So I would suggest that if that's a concern that people have that they either want more clarity or they want some different provision that that's an item that ought to be presented in the public comments.

MALE: So right now there is no (not understandable) that addresses the (not understandable)?

CHUCK LEDIN: Well there are some indirect ways but there aren't, there's not like you have four and as soon as you get the fifth one then you shut off. Or there's discussion about (not understandable) but that's an area that there's a great deal of uncertainty about and how you would administer it. Would you administer it on the basis of this is the same inspection that takes place in grand fathering. Right now grand fathering, exempting use is based on capacity. Some people asked that the grandfather (not understandable) not to be based on capacity but on existing uses. Some places they put a capacity that's good for 50 years so you shouldn't reach the 50 year capacity (not understandable) existing use. And that's another area that they're hoping to get comment on this proposal by (not understandable) now. But again all of these things that are in there are being advanced to get reactions or to get comments from people on it. They're not being advanced as a proposal from the State of Wisconsin, rather this the closest to consensus the 10 governments could get right now is framework and there are those specific areas that we are encouraging people to provide their thoughts on to help deal with those issues.

MALE: (not understandable) of the pollution problem presumably parts of it, some parts of, quite a bit of (not understandable) Great Lakes are more polluted than others. And I think it gets down to reasonable for a city or county's responsibility (not understandable) this particular (not understandable) doesn't speak to the concern about pollution or maybe it's indirectly concerned about pollution.

CHUCK LEDIN: On one of the overheads there where I listed the no (not understandable) and no alternatives, no significant (not understandable) impact and no reasonable alternatives in the conservation plan, at the bottom it says has to meet all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. Right now there already is a national framework for meeting water quality standards that in this case is implemented (not understandable) so any discharge that went back would have to meet the water quality standards.

MALE: (not understandable) all the states in the (not understandable) out. Somehow or another they (not understandable) toxicity of all the Great Lakes (not understandable) taking great steps

to ameliorate the situation. I am wondering if there's different degrees of concern about this between the two (not understandable).

CHUCK LEDIN: Well I would say there are probably varying degrees of concern (not understandable) but I think everyone believes that the water should be (not understandable) in a way that does not adversely impact the quality of the Great Lakes or (not understandable) assistance. The vehicle that that's implemented by will maybe be different than one state than the other state. But at least the quality of the Great Lakes, the integrity of the Great Lakes should be protected as part of the review process. Particularly to those who (not understandable) a threshold I guarantee that every state and province is going to be looking at it from the perspective of local return flow of the (not understandable).

MALE: Is that another question?

FEMALE: No. I'm wondering if anyone is looking into sort of the mass balance or whether there are scientific thresholds that absolutely you know can set off red flags or (not understandable), come back to the table and talk about allocating based on water (not understandable)?

CHUCK LEDIN: Well I would say no but I'm sure some other people would say yes. What we have agreed to do is look at what's happened every five years. But in terms of trying to figure out this mass balance it always gets compounded by mother nature. The natural variation of Lake Michigan right now is 63 inches. Between it's high and it's low. Lake Superior is far less. But if you try to do these mass balance kind of looks and withdrawal well the lake level goes down during a dry period, your data start using more water, more people are watering their lawn, so we have a difficult time in our lifetimes trying to get data together that says this is how we use water. And when the hydrologic patterns shift so we have a smaller outflow from Lake Superior or coming in from Canada or whatever some of the sources are, it's just an extremely difficult thing to do. And then it's even more complicated by the way the groundwater table responds and some of, the amount of time that it takes for recharge which in some cases might now be in the decades or centuries on some of the aquifers that this is an area that we need to do a lot more with, we need a lot more research, we need more information, we need better data, we need ways to analyze that data that are than to deal with the frailties of the human mind to try to comprehend such a figure.

FEMALE: Right now basically I'm looking at numbers (not understandable).

CHUCK LEDIN: Right.

FEMALE: (not understandable).

CHUCK LEDIN: There are no outright prohibitions right now except ah there has to be repairing(?) and access to the surface water and there has to be, you have to be able to own some land to get to the groundwater or have somebody that owns land get, but there are no like limits that say you can't use water like this. Now the new groundwater legislation sets up some procedures about looking at the interrelationships between wells and wells and surface water and some surface waters that maybe you'd like to comment on.

MALE: Well I don't think there's any absolute thresholds for the amount of water or number of wells being put in a given area. But it does set up a framework for managing groundwater (not understandable).

FEMALE: (not understandable) I don't know, is rather ambiguous terms with these standards or whatever. What is the oversee to any of this besides safety standards in (not understandable)?

CHUCK LEDIN: It would be the governors and the premiers and their designees. And...

FEMALE: ...so they have bodies under them scientists or whoever it's I assume there's criteria under these standards that say these are the standards that say no adverse affect (not understandable).

CHUCK LEDIN: Those would be the standards right now. And one of the comments that has been made at several of the sessions is that the standards are kind of categories but they aren't specific enough to get the definitions, so again those are some of the things we're seeking comments on.

FEMALE: Will those, what you showed up those bulletin items those are the standards? There's no underlying criteria (not understandable)?

CHUCK LEDIN: That's why we're seeking comments.

(laughter)

CHUCK LEDIN: The point is to have um everyone looking at these the same way. With the same kind of data needs, so whether you're in New York or whether you're in Minnesota your application looks the same and the review of it looks the same.

MALE: There is (not understandable) this so you'll know (not understandable) talks about the (not understandable)...

CHUCK LEDIN: ...that talks about...

MALE: It gives examples of what the standards might look like. So...

FEMALE: ...there's no (not understandable)?

MALE: (not understandable).

MALE: Yeah what population do you use to (not understandable) or is it not used at this (not understandable)?

CHUCK LEDIN: Well it's not used except in one of the standards was is the, is the amount of water being asked for a reasonable amount. So there it would be linked to the population. And some of the exemptions that are there like the 250,000 for those communities that straddle the border that can only be used for residential water use so then that would be linked to the population objectives there. But there isn't like a controlled management (not understandable) for ties to the water use.

MALE: Then what you're saying is (not understandable).

CHUCK LEDIN: For residential water use.

MODERATOR: Any other questions? All right I think a move to public comments period in (not understandable) come down to the podium here, give your name, your affiliation, and your

address. And first if there are more appearance slips over here, so if you want an appearance slip at this time just raise your hand and I'll pass them out. The first person, Rand Atkinson.

RAND: Hi. My name is Rand Atkinson, my address is N4546 Butternut Lane, Birnamwood, Wisconsin.

MODERATOR: And your affiliation?

MALE: No affiliation but I was asked by the Wisconsin Wildlife Federation to make some comments, at least they were sent to me I don't know is there anyone else here representing the Wisconsin Wildlife Federation? I guess not. So I guess I will comment on those also. But also my personal comments regarding what I understand.

MODERATOR: Okay.

RAND: I spent 30 years reviewing water related versions, regulations, um on water. And over that time of course one thing that I notice is any fluctuation in water, even natural fluctuations of (not understandable) that are climatic related or whatever can have great effects on even the smallest ecosystem. Um it's funny that you mentioned the Portage, the natural Portage canal diversion, we have another one in northern Wisconsin that just happens to be on my farm between the Wisconsin River system and the Great Lake system and that's actually occurs at Norrie, Norrie, Wisconsin. And just a simple fluctuation in the controlling of water level um on Norrie Lake actually diverted water from one system to the next. Just an act of putting in a culvert under the Mountain Bay Trail. I'm just trying to give you very simple actions that can affect but the more I think about this we have a lot of precedents that we've set on diversions. One of course was the Anwar Dam in Egypt that actually diverted the flow of the Nile River to actually create agriculture in some areas that wasn't meant to be to save population shifts in that great diverseness caused more problems than beginning. Of course we have two in the United States. The Texas Water Diversion Plan and the California Diversion Plan of the Bureau of Land Management. And those systems and as you can see it's in the headlines of almost everyday in California the effects between population shifts and needs to feed people. But I think our system here in getting to the point is just by setting up these standards that we're looking at um I feel are we setting a precedent of affecting not only our own ecosystem but other ecosystems as well that weren't made to deal with the water that might be diverted to them. Okay, an example would be Las Vegas, the fastest growing population in a city in the United States and right next door you got a second city those reservoirs down there are losing every year and it's not only climactic change, it's jut the fact that we have the worst shift in population of people even with a zero population growth. And we're trying to come up with a solution to solve these problems but my biggest thing is are we setting a precedent and eventually causing a proliferation just by setting these standards? That we can shift populations around and not, not because of food shortages, not because of population growth, but just socially that we want to go to Arizona. Okay? Is everybody going to leave Florida now and go to Arizona because of the tornadoes? These decisions that we're making on water diversion can affect that (not understandable). More specifically and I don't want to waste your time also, but there's some things in the agreement I thought were also good. Um, the requirement that water taken out of the lake basin for use has to return to the basin. Again, I'm thinking ecologically, you know what type of water are we going to get back? We have water quality standards but do we have standards for one of the provisions of the thing is to put money so exotics don't come in? Okay do we have standards that say or controls that where having return pipeline from someplace that we're going to have some small epizootic coming in that we don't even know about. Okay? These are the risks you have when you're diverting water from one ecosystem to the next. Um, and that's very scary okay. But we've got it but

what are the specifics of it? Um, there's a requirement that use of the Great Lakes water will need to employ water conservation practices. Um, my question is why haven't they, they hadn't been done already in the Southwest, and if they wish to do it in the Southwest, why aren't they...they aren't implementing their own conservation practices now. You just have to go to Sun City or Sun City, Arizona, the whole Phoenix area and you'll see that happening now. Okay, but the trade offs are going between golf courses and municipal well water pumping. Is, you don't have a conservation plan now so how do you expect if they convert it they're going to use it. Politically I'm not sure that's a very good point. For the first time with this type of agreement there's a requirement that water diverters must do something additional to improve the Great Lakes. This may include habitat protection, restoration, or work on the basic species management. I would like to see closer standards put on that. Um, we can't wait until the situation arises, like a tanker pulls in just like what happened. I think we have to have a plan in effect with that. That's saying, okay this money is going there, and of course I'm not a great believer in a bureaucracy that's going to consume something without getting something done. Ah I like more of a proactive approach to it. This is what has to be done with that money, okay? The agreement between the states contains good enforcement vision which allows each Great States an (not understandable) to ensure that the states are living up to the agreement. Of course I think you discussed that earlier but it's good that here we are dealing with two countries, let alone states that has a big watershed or concern of from New York to Michigan where you've got a lot of political clout from a number of people that can sway the decision quite easily, politically. Especially if it's at the Governor's will, the task force, the people that are going to make the decision. The agreement contains good public participation opportunities for citizens (not understandable) water withdrawals. And that's good but how much is that going to count toward the whole weight of what's happening. The weight of what's happening. Okay. Um, what we need to be improved besides what you're trying to do um agreement needs to spell out more precisely the water conservation members, measures, that water users need to improve. Okay I guess I related to that before but what I'm saying is what are they? Okay? In other words, we can talk about the Great Lakes but how can we have some enforcement in Arizona and in Texas and the Southwest. Do we have any authority to do that? Um, ten years, okay here we are. This is more of a bureaucratic thing. Ten years that's too long of a period to phase in the agreement. Okay you say you need it because the massive amount of states that are involved and provinces. Um, I think you need to set a deadline on this because the pressures um of what's happening at least five years or shorter to implement. We don't have 10 years. You know these ecosystems are being affected so quickly and we have great changes occurring. The provision where anyone taking large amount of water for more than 30 days a year should be required to get a permit. Okay there's a lot of, and this is very important because there's a lot of loopholes. I shouldn't say it...any industry, anybody that really wants to do something can always work around it as it was mentioned over here you know? Because you have one state and ten different companies come up to that state and divert water under different names and all go to the same place. Okay? So what I'm saying is if you tighten up the amount of pumping that can happen over 30 days you know, do we take it all at once, do we take it over agreed a period of time that's very important to shorten that up. Um, the third one, unregulated smaller water withdrawals I think we've mentioned that in our question period. Need to be monitored to insure that many of them that do occur do not result in damage to the Great Lakes. Again this is a cumulative effect, okay how, okay you got the permit process, now you've got the oversight to watch everything happening but what's going to happen when these things proliferate and once you set a standard that yes you can do that, I just see it getting out of control. So I guess that's, those are the concerns of the Wisconsin Wildlife Federation and myself personally. Um, when you question the ability and scientific knowledge to try to understand the cumulative effect over a big area you know are we ever going to be able to do that? You know, sometime along the line we're going to have to make a empirical decisions based on this happened in a small system and I mentioned the Norrie bog system that I live in. Okay? There's some parallels between the small system and a

large system and (not understandable) you can start making some decisions at that time based on not clear science. We have to make empirical decisions because it will never happen. We can't afford it, we cannot wait for it to come through and the other thing is, there is 11 year wet-drought cycle that affects the Midwest. We have data going back to early 1900's on our own Wisconsin River system and I'm sure it could be applied to the Great Lakes with the amount of states that we have. That there is climactic effects and documented through sun(?) spots and if we look at that and look at some of that data I think we can come up with some better understandings of the great fluctuations in our Great Lakes and probably plan for that as part of this process.

MODERATOR: Thank you.

RAND: You bet.

MODERATOR: Derek Scheer. State your name, address, and who you are affiliated with.

DEREK: Ah, my name is Derek Sheer. I represent Clean Wisconsin. My address is 122 State Street, Madison, Wisconsin. Um I've lived outside of the basin but utilized the basin for all my life and these comments are kind of are reflected on my love of the Great Lakes and the basin. These comments address issues in the Great Lakes basin water resource compact. That seems to be the enforceable part of this implementing agreement. Creating enforceable standards appears to be the most important goal of the annex 2001. Therefore that's why I'm focused you know, on the compact. The proposed compact among eight Great Lakes states is an important step forward in protecting the Great Lakes basin from both water exports and diversions and abuse. We feel that despite hearing from Canada and both presidential candidates that the standard is the most important part. We can't just ban water in, in the U.S. um in the Great Lakes basin because of the near basin converters that are going to need water because of the commerce clause. So it would feel like this is a big step forward. However, ah it needs significant improvement to achieve it's aims of fully protecting the basin's ecosystem from damage caused by water withdrawals. When I say it needs improvement, I think basically I'm just pointing out what direction we would go, the working group has given us options, 1 million gallons per day versus 5 million gallons per day. So in particular the compact needs changes to assure that future state vetoes and powerful withdrawals are able to withstand possible court challenges. Um, this is not a management system because it only deals with new and increased water withdrawals. Mostly ignoring the potential ecosystem damage caused by existing withdrawals. And as primarily systems for reviewing individual water projects, the agreement also provides no overall basin water planning or even significant incentives for individual communities to undertake such planning. That would reduce overall human water consumption in the basin and therefore reduce the number and size of withdrawals and withdrawal proposals. The compact should reference international agreement's procedure manual. Perhaps by declaring it should provide general guidance in writing state and compact council roles implementing the standards. This is needed to assure the standards achieve at least a minimum of consistency and effectiveness across the basin. Improvement standard should apply to all withdrawals. Subjecting withdrawals to the standards of no-harm conservation, improvement and was the core commitment of the Annex 2001. And currently consumptive use under 5 million gallons per day doesn't have that improvement standard and we think it should be applied. The compact should firmly commit the parties to establishing rigorous consumptive use standards or coefficients by specific dates. It's the only means to assure the effectiveness of the return flow standard. If you take water out, you have to put it back but you can lose some when you take it out through a backward of loss or whatever. And you need to have a very strict standard for how much loss is allowable. Otherwise the return flow doesn't mean anything. The levels of withdrawals should be subjected to standards, should be based on withdrawal quantities averaged over 30 days, not 120 days. At the withdrawal levels in questions,

depending on the size of the source watershed, averaging over periods longer than 30 days will exempt the oversight many withdrawal projects ah certain to cause ecosystem damage. The level for subjecting consumptive uses in basin withdrawals to regional review should either be 1 million gallons per day of consumptive loss or simply 5 million gallons per day withdrawal. Just get rid of the consumptive loss and base it on withdrawal rather. The proposed level of 5 million gallons per day of consumptive loss when the level for diversions with identical generic impacts you know, consumptive loss is loss from the basin, diversion is loss from the basin, is a million gallons per day and is so blatantly discriminatory that it seriously undermines the compact's potential for legal durability and fairness cause of GAT(?) and NAFTA. Um, the phase-in standards for consumptive use in basin withdrawals reviewed by the state should be five years rather than ten. A longer phase in, by permitting such a wide gap between commitment to reform and it's implementation, invites discord within and among the states and risks the medium term failure of the compact. The quasi-humanitarian exemption. From the return flow standard for small near basin diversions should be modified to prevent it's misuse to support sprawl either by limiting the diverted water to existing structures, or limiting the number of permissible exemptions per state. What we talked about the cumulative impact. Ah protection of the public trust responsibilities and rights must be included in the compact's declaration that the compact will not affect existing water rights. This is public trust doctrine is too important in Wisconsin to fail that. The current definition of return flow appears to require return of the actual water withdrawal. This is the critical protection against the introduction of invasive species from neighboring watersheds and must be retained in the final document. Thank you for having this hearing and for taking on this monumental task. We'll submit further comments in writing.

MODERATOR: (not understandable). Any other people? Go ahead and state your name, address, and who you represent.

JACOB: Jacob Barnes, Amherst, Wisconsin, board representing the River Alliance of Wisconsin. I'm here to offer the River Alliance's support for the proposed Great Lakes...

MODERATOR: ...state your address please.

JACOB: Um, 10225 Two Rivers Drive, Amherst. Ah we would like to commend the Governor and premier, premiers for their far-sighted concerns about the Great Lakes that are reflected in the draft proposals. Simply stated we need this compact. Overall the draft agreement protects the Great Lakes, sets water quantity standards, covers all basin waters, surface waters, streams and groundwater and addresses water diversion. A very positive feature is that the compact is to be legally binding and be consistently applied across all states and provinces. We believe that the draft could be strengthened, however. We think that the following should be considered for inclusion to improve the compact and close some loopholes. These improvements to the compact would help preserve this incredibly valuable resource. The compact should be implemented in five years rather than ten. Demand for Great Lakes water will increase on this thirsty, ever warming globe and we need this protection for the lakes as soon as possible. Old water withdrawal should conform to the new standards, water should be returned to the basins from which it was withdrawn. The temperature of the water returning to the lakes should be within a few degrees of the lake water temperature. If there's a consistent drop in water level withdrawal amounts must be lowered. All diversion of water, regardless of amount and regardless of where the diversion goes should be subject to the same rules. There must be a detailed plan to require water conservation within the basin. Thank you very much.

MODERATOR: Thank you. Anyone else? Last chance. Okay, I'd like to remind you again that written comments may be made by submitting them to the Council of Great Lakes (not understandable) until October the 18th (not understandable).

(laughter)

CHUCK LEDIN: So this yellow slip that gives the address and the website for (not understandable) and I'd like to thank you all for coming.

MALE: (not understandable) would like to know about the history of the Great Lakes and (not understandable).

CHUCK LEDIN: Well I would say that there are three good places to go. See…

(end of tape)
(transcribed by Sally Berray)